App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment AF Dated June 2, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action Dated April 3, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are amended as set forth above. Claims 2, 6-7, 14, and 18-28 are cancelled.

Applicants believe that the claims overcome the cited references. No new matter has been

added.

I.   Interview with Examiner Henning

Several interviews were held with Examiner Henning. Applicants believe that an

agreement was reached as to elements that overcome the cited references. This Response

reflects the interviews. Applicants request another interview with Examiner Henning if there

still exists outstanding issues.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-28 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

No. 6,301,484 issued to Rogers et al. ("Rogers") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,342 issued to

Ho. ("Ho"). The claims have been amended as set forth herein for clarity purposes.

Applicants' claim 1 recites the following *combination* of elements that is not taught or

suggested by the references:

> "receiving a message, wherein the message identifies the source of the message
> and changes to settings of the mobile device;"
>
> "identifying, *by a push router of the mobile device*, the source of the received
> message, wherein the push router associates a security role *with the received
> message* based on the identified source of the *received message* and *inserts an
> identifier into the received message* to identify the associated security role;"
>
> "passing the message *to a configuration manager*;"

"parsing, *by the configuration manager,* the message to identify *at least one configuration service provider, among a plurality of configuration service providers, responsible for the settings identified in the message;*"

"determining whether the assigned security role of the message, assigned by the push router, is sufficient to invoke the identified configuration service provider;"

"failing the transaction when the assigned security role of the message is not sufficient;"

"*passing the message to the configuration service provider when the assigned security role of the message is sufficient, wherein the identified configuration security provider determines whether the assigned security role of the message is sufficient for settings associated with the configuration service provider;*"

"failing the transaction when the assigned security role of the message is insufficient for the settings; and"

"performing the changes to the settings of the mobile device when the configuration service provider determines that the security role of the message is sufficient."

The specification of the present invention includes several examples. These examples are

not referenced herein to limit the claims in any manner. The examples are referenced herein to

help explain a few aspects of the present invention. The specification recites one example as

follows:

> FIGURE 7 is a logical flow diagram generally summarizing a process for applying security roles to configuration messages used in a mobile device. Although illustrated as a single flow chart, operations performed at various stages of the process may be performed by different components within the system. For example, referring to FIGURE 7, the operations performed at the blocks within the dashed-line box 701 may be performed by the push router 301 described above. Similarly, the operations performed at the blocks within the dashed-line box 708 may be performed by the configuration manager 401. And the operations performed at the blocks within the dashed-line box 716 may be performed by a CSP 411-413.
>
> To begin, at block 703 a configuration message is received. The configuration message identifies its source and certain configuration transactions to be

performed. At block 705, a security role is assigned to the message based on the source of the message. The source of the message may be determined through traditional authentication techniques. The security role assigned to the message corresponds to security credentials that have been pre-selected for the source of the message. At block 707, the message (including security role) is passes (sic) to an application registered to handle the configuration transaction.

At block 709, the message is parsed to identify a CSP that is responsible to perform the requested configuration transaction. At block 711, a verification is performed to determine if the security role of the message is sufficient to invoke the identified CSP. As mentioned, each CSP has its own security role. If the security role of the message is insufficient, the transaction fails at block 714 and the configuration transaction is rolled back by returning any changed settings to their previous values. If the security role of the message is sufficient, the responsible CSP is invoked and passed the configuration message at block 715. To optimize performance, querying and mapping of the CSP role assignments and the message role assignments occurs before any processing is done by any of the CSPs. If a mismatch between the role assignments is found the transaction fails.

At block 717, a verification is performed to determine if the security role of the message is sufficient to access the affected settings. As mentioned, each setting or group of settings has its own security role. If the security role of the message is insufficient, the transaction fails at block 714 and the configuration transaction is rolled back. However, if the security role of the message is sufficient, the CSP performs the requested configuration transaction at block 721. The process then ends at block 723. *Specification*, at pg. 15, line 19 - pg. 16, line 28.

The unique combination of elements recited above in claim 1 is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. More specifically, applicants assert that the proposed combination of references fails to teach or otherwise suggest the following:

1.   Claim 1 has been amended to tie processes to software components of the mobile device. Applicants can find no such teaching in either of the references.

2.   Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the push router makes a security determination associated with the message and the configuration service provider. Claim 1 has also been amended to indicate that the configuration service provider makes a security determination associated with the message and the settings. Applicants can find no such teaching in either of the references.

3.   Claim 1 has been amended to indicate processing to a message (as identified in claim 1) during a configuration process. However, Rogers does not

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment AF Dated June 2, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action Dated April 3, 2006

teach such processing to a configuration message and Ho teaches two separate transmissions and no processing of a configuration message whatsoever.

Independent claims 8 and 13 have been amended to include some similar elements as independent claim 1. Applicants believe that independent claims 8 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 1. Regarding the dependent claims, claims 3-5, 9-12, and 15-17 include elements not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Also, claims 3-5, 9-12, and 15-17 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 13, respectively. Claims 1, 8, and 13 are thought allowable as stated above. Accordingly, applicants believe that claims 3-5, 9-12, and 15-17 are allowable for at least those same reasons.

III.   Request For Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment AF Dated June 2, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action Dated April 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Ryan T. Grace
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

Page 12 of 12